DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 104 CS 503 216

AUTHOR Ansell, Kathleen K.
TITLE The Androgynous Manager: Myth or Reality for the Workplace Negotiations of the 1980's?
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (66th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Androgyny; Communication Research; *Employee Attitudes; *Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Communication; *Sex Role; *Supervisors

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the relationship between male and female employees' perceptions of the androgynous/nonandrogynous communication style of their immediate supervisors and their own job satisfaction. Subjects were 100 males and 100 females employed in business and industrial settings and responsible to male supervisors. The subjects completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory according to how well each characteristic described his or her immediate supervisor. Perceptions of job satisfaction were measured through the use of ten researcher-designed questions and 21 items extrapolated from the Job Description Index. Analyses of the results indicated that no significant relationship existed between an androgynous supervisor's communication style and employee job satisfaction. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196104

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ANDROGYNOUS MANAGER: MYTH OR REALITY FOR THE WORKPLACE NEGOTIATIONS OF THE 1980'S?

by

Kathleen K. Ansell
Edinboro State College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kathleen K. Ansell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

This study was concerned with an investigation of the relationship between male and female subordinates' perceptions of the androgynous communication style of their immediate supervisors and subordinates' overall job satisfaction. These variables were measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), extrapolated items from the Job Description Index (JDI), and researcher-designed questions. Results from Pearson Product Moment correlations, Student's t tests, chi square tests, and the Multiple Regression Analysis test indicated that a significant relationship does not exist between an androgynous manager's communication style and employee's general job satisfaction.

Speech Communication Association
New York

November, 1980

CS 503 216

THE ANDROGYNOUS MANAGER: MYTH OR REALITY

FOR THE WORKPLACE NEGOTIATIONS OF THE 1980'S?

In Lewis Carroll's "Alice in Wonderland," we learn that a harried and frustrated Alice must master the art of running faster and faster in order to stay right where she is. Things have not yet reached that curious state in the modern wonderland we all live in, but the danger signals are looming. For any employed man or woman, the luxury of just standing still is nonexistent. It is inevitable that we are either moving ahead. . .or falling behind. Let it be assumed that the "moving ahead" aspect takes precedence over the "falling behind" and we can therefore explore that which is involved as men and women renegotiate their roles in workplace institutions.

The art of negotiating belongs, apparently, to interpersonal communicators as well as to organizational communicators. The Latin root "negotium" (meaning business) is derived from the combined forms of "nec-" (not) plus "otium" (ease). To negotiate, according to Webster, is "to confer or discuss with a view to reaching agreement." Renegotiating roles as employed men and women involves, then, such communication transactions as conferring, discussing, and agreeing. But if we take a literal translation of the negotiating process, it cannot happen with ease. As Alice discovered, running in place only provided good exercise--not a chance for moving ahead.

What are some of the processes whereby renegotiations occur in workplace contexts? As men and women strive to examine their separate and/or overlapping roles on the job, what communication transactions are actually involved in this complicated "moving ahead" process?

In viewing communication as transaction, Pearce and Sharp (1973) contend that

> . . .a transactional communication analysis directs attention to the process occurring between the participants. It is what happens when communicators transact with each other rather than characteristics of either or both in other contexts which provides an understanding of. . .communication (p. 413).

It is well documented within the organizational communication literature that effective leadership is dependent upon a "good" relationship between both leaders and followers. Bonnie McDaniel Johnson has, in fact, observed: "In any social system where people are organized into hierarchies, there are no more important relationships than those which exist between subordinates and their immediate superiors" (1977, p. 295).

The organizational communication field has witnessed in the past decade a resurgence of interest in the study of managerial leadership (Ashour, 1973; Dunnette, 1976; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Fleisman & Hunt, 1973; Graen, Dansereau, & Minami, 1972). So all-pervasive has this concept of leadership been in other disciplines that Vroom asserts, "There are few problems of interest to behavioral scientists with as much apparent relevance to the problems of society as the study of leadership" (1976, p. 1527). John MacGregor Burns, however, points out the milieu in which leadership exists. According to Burns, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (1978, p. 2).

At a time when leadership studies are becoming more concerned with work-related male/female dyads, employees' perceptions and attitudes toward dyads, and sex-role stereotyping within organizational contexts, this study examines the supposition that the communication style of the manager/supervisor is crucial to effective superior/subordinate interpersonal relationships. The purpose of the present study is, therefore, to investigate the relationship between a subordinate's

general satisfaction or dissatisfaction with his or her job. More specifically, it is hypothesized that the perceptions held by subordinates regarding the communication style of their immediate superior is an index of their general job satisfaction.

There is a current trend among management theorists to examine styles of leadership and the effect(s) these styles have upon subordinates. At a time when organizational writers are discussing "organizational development," "contingency management," "situational management," and "human resource management," there is emerging a new emphasis on a style of management which highlights a concern for people rather than a concern for task and production. While in the past the democratic, participative and employee-centered manager was considered to be the most effective leader, it is now advanced within this study that it is the "androgynous supervisor" who is emerging as the manager of the future.

The nature of man's behavior in work organizations is dependent upon the motivations, attitudes, and communication needs of both managers and subordinates. Research would indicate that an employee's satisfaction with his/her job is related to perceptions of the interpersonal communication relationship between supervisors and subordinates (Pelz, 1951, 1967; Rosen, 1969). In their extensive review of the literature on job satisfaction, Herzberg et al (1957) concluded that a manager's style of supervision affects the job satisfaction of subordinates.

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), whose Supervision and Promotions sub-scales (JDI) have been extrapolated for use in the present study, offer a view of job satisfaction considered germane to this research. According to Smith et al,

> . . .Job satisfactions (are) feelings a worker has about his job. To expand on this definition, we can say that there are different feelings corresponding to differentiable aspects of the job. We can further examine some of the conditions which we feel exert major influences on feelings of satisfaction. First, of course, are the specific aspects of the job--the nature of the work itself, the details of remuneration, the nature of promotional opportunities, the characteristics of supervision, and the attributes of co-workers on the job--all of which may be considered as sources of satisfactions or dissatisfactions (1969, p. 12).

Thus it is that the concept of job satisfaction used in this study is one which relates to an employee's present and/or past attitude toward his/her work. For purposes of this study, job satisfaction encompasses such indices as feelings about the job and satisfaction with advancement (intrinsic factors) as well as satisfaction with the human relations style of leadership (extrinsic factors).

If, as has been established, the supervisor's communication style affects the underlying work-related motivations of subordinates, there is rationalization for examining how this style correlates with general job satisfaction and perceptions of promotability in particular. The crucial empirical question about supervisory style is not the traditional one of, Do supervisors affect job satisfaction perceptions of subordinates? but the differential one of, Under what style of supervision do subordinates perceive a greater degree of satisfaction with the job? Such a question pertains directly to a conceptual communication model which would relate the intrapersonal perceptions of subordinates with the interpersonal communication style of their manager/supervisor.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of the androgynous/nonandrogynous communication style of their immediate supervisors and subordinates' job satisfaction. The study presented here was designed to begin to empirically explore concepts within the area of organizational communication and interpersonal communication not previously researched. These data will begin to answer differential questions relating to communication transactions between superiors and subordinates within workplace institutions. This study will also begin to examine basic male/female perceptual differences in an effort to ascertain whether, indeed, men and women are similar in their perceptions of the variables under investigation.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

Subjects used for this study were 100 males and 100 females employed in business/industrial settings in northwestern Pennsylvania. In order to assure maximum heterogeneity, subjects representative of many professions and several business-related organizations were utilized in the study.

Instrumentation

Independent Variable. The theoretical assumptions of this study are based on the notion that a supervisor's communication style is defined as a specialized set of interpersonal behaviors which emerge in a given situation. Because this study views one's androgynous orientation to be a part of the internal factors emerging out of the personal makeup of the individual communicator, the independent variable, androgynous communication style, was measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI).

The BSRI was utilized within this study to measure perceptions of the interpersonal communication between the subordinate and his/her supervisor. In marking the BSRI, each respondent was asked to indicate on a scale from 1 (Never or almost never true) to 7 (Always or almost always true) how well each characteristic described his/her immediate manager/supervisor.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory was designed to measure masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions, thereby making it possible to characterize a person as masculine, feminine, or androgynous as a function of the difference between his or her endorsement of masculine or feminine personality characteristics. Bem (1974) has shown internal consistency of the BSRI. The coefficient alpha was computed separately for M and F scales in each of the two normative samples. The

scores were highly reliable M a = .86 and F a = .82). The reliability of the androgyny score was .85. Test-retest reliability indicated high scores over a four-week interval (masculinity = .90, femininity = .90, and androgyny = .93) for a college sample population.

As suggested by Bem & Lenney (1976) and Bem, Martyra, & Watson (1976), medians of the masculinity/femininity scores are used to divide Ss into one of the following four discriminant categories: masculine (high masculine-low feminine), feminine (low masculine-high feminine), androgynous (high masculine-high feminine), and undifferentiated (low masculine-low feminine). For the present study, the median scores of 109 and 81, masculine and feminine respectively, were used yielding 40 androgynous, 4 feminine, 105 masculine, and 51 undifferentiated identities.

Dependent Variable. This study was interested in examining the dependent variable of subordinate job satisfaction as related to the androgynous communication style of supervisors. The perceptions of job satisfaction as held by 100 male and 100 female subordinates was measured through the use of ten researcher-designed questions and twenty-one extrapolated items from the standardized Satisfaction with Supervision and Satisfaction with Promotions sub-scales of the Job Description Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). A copy of the ten researcher-designed questions contained in the original instrument appears in Appendix A.

Respondents' satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with promotional policies within their organizational hierarchies was measured on the extrapolated Satisfaction with Supervision and Satisfaction with Promotions sub-scales of the Job Description Index (JDI) (see Appendix B). The scales have been shown to be highly sensitive to differences in the situation and nature of the work force. The areas were designed to be measured separately and with adequate reliability. Extensive research has indicated that reliability and validity of the JDI are

excellent. Corrected split-half internal consistency coefficients are reported to exceed .80 for each of the scales. Of the many instruments available for the measure of job satisfaction, the JDI is considered to be superior. Vroom (1964) has said of the JDI, "Without doubt (it is) the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today" (p. 100).

For purposes of this study, standardized scales and researcher-designed questions were not administered as separate and discrete instruments. For scoring purposes, standardized scales were used for the BSRI and the JDI sub-scale items. All items on the researcher-designed questions were weighted independently and scored as single items.

Procedures

Subjects in this study were members of seven business-related civic/service organizations who identified themselves to the experimenter as currently employed men and women responsible to a male supervisor. At their regularly scheduled organization meeting(s), Ss were requested to take copies of the instrument home, to complete the questionnaires as instructed, and to return the instruments through the mail as soon as possible.

Design and Data Analysis

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between male and female subordinates' perceptions of the androgynous/nonandrogynous communication style of their immediate supervisors and subordinates' job satisfaction. The instrument designed to measure employee's perceptions was a 107-item questionnaire. In order to determine the relationship, if any, between the independent and the dependent variables, a Pearson Product Moment correlation was considered appropriate. All correlations obtained in the analysis were tested at the .05 level of significance. Statistical tests (Student's t test for the parametric

data and chi square test for the non-parametric data) were conducted in order to determine support for pooling the male and female data given in the assessment instruments. Since sufficient evidence was found to support pooling of the data, the Multiple Regression Analysis was performed. The MRA was computed in an effort to determine the best predictor(s) of job satisfaction as responded to by the 100 males and 100 females in the sample.

RESULTS

The relationship between perceptions of the androgynous communication style of supervisors and job satisfaction of male and female subordinates was examined by means of the Pearson Product Moment correlation. This particular statistical technique permitted the researcher to isolate and understand more fully the nature of relationships among the variables. Tables 1 and 2 present the correlations between perceptions of supervisory androgynous orientation and the

Table 1

twelve selected measures of job satisfaction as reported by 100 males and 100 females in the sample. The Pearson Product Moment correlations between androgynous orientation and the twelve components of job satisfaction showed that

Table 2

there was a significant correlation between only three components of job satisfaction and the androgynous orientation variable. These significant components

were "Told Prospects Were Good" (Item I:19) and "Satisfaction with Promotions" (Item IV) for the males (see Table 1) and "Time at Current Title" (Item I:14) for the female population (see Table 2). No significant difference was found for the remaining components.

To determine if differences existed between males and females on all thirteen variables (twelve components of job satisfaction and one variable of androgynous orientation), both parametric tests and non-parametric tests were used as appropriate. The first three assessments, Androgynous Orientation (BSRI), Satisfaction with Supervision (JDI), and Satisfaction with Promotions (JDI), were considered as measures and tested using Student's t. The remaining ten components of job satisfaction were considered to be non-parametric. Contingency Table Chi square was used for purposes of comparison.

Table 3 describes the results of the t test for the independent variable (androgynous communication style of supervisors) and the selected measures of job satisfaction. These results are based on the responses of the two groups sampled. The pooled variance model was designed to measure the homogeneity of these two population variances. As reflected in Table 3, the t value for the

---

Table 3

BSRI (Androgynous Orientation) was 0.37; the JDI Satisfaction with Supervision sub-scale was 0.10; and the extrapolated items from the JDI Satisfaction with Promotions sub-scale was 1.7[illegible]. The calculated t values did not exceed the tabled values and therefore, it was concluded that there was no significant difference.

To determine whether or not there were any significant differences between male and female subordinates' perceptions on the ten selected components of job satisfaction, a chi square (x^2) test was computer (see Table 4). The results

Table 4

indicated that there was support for pooling the data. Nine out of the ten components of job satisfaction showed no significant difference between the males and females sampled. One measure of job satisfaction, "Told Prospects Were Good" (Item I:19) was significant at the .05 level of confidence. This significance was ignored, however, due to the heavy support for pooling the data provided by the other variables.

Since support existed for pooling the data, a Multiple Regression Analysis test was performed. Tables 5 and 6 describe the results of the MRA. These

Table 5

tables report the variables in the order of their contribution to the equation. The Multiple R designation signified the contribution of each variable to the total correlation of all the variables. In each case, the first variable

Table 6

listed correlated highest with subordinates' perceptions of the androgynous orientation of supervisors. As can be seen from the tables, only ten of the

twelve variables are displayed. Because the least important variables contributed little in the way of increased information, only the ten most important correlations for each group are reported. Other variables, considered to be noncontributing, were removed.

In Table 5 (the Multiple Regression Analysis for the male population) the first variable used was "Told Prospects Were Good" (Item I:19). The Multiple and Simple R value between androgynous communication style and this variable is 0.22. The addition of the other nine variables one at a time to the Multiple Regression Analysis produced a final multiple R value of 0.38. Little gain was noted after the addition of the seventh variable which is "Years with Company" (Item I:12).

As Table 6 reveals, the question asking the female employees to indicate their time at current title correlated highest with perceptions of the androgynous communication style of their immediate supervisor. Multiple and Simple R for the relationship was 0.22. The addition of the other nine variables one at a time to the Multiple Regression Analysis produced a final multiple R value of 0.38. The last four variables contributed relatively little more to the equation.

DISCUSSION

The findings generated by the various statistical analyses indicate that subordinates' perceptions of the androgynous communication style of supervisors appears to be only marginally related to their overall job satisfaction. Evidence was presented from 100 responding males in the sample that, of the twelve selected components of job satisfaction, only the measures "Told Prospects Were Good" and "Satisfaction with Promotions" were found to correlate significantly with perceptions of the androgynous communication style of the subordinates' supervisors.

The 100 employed females in the study reported a significant relationship between the singular job satisfaction component, "Time at Current Title," and perceptions of their immediate supervisor's androgynous communication style. The data would indicate that since none of the other selected indices of job satisfaction correlated with perceptions of the androgynous communication style of supervisors, it can be concluded that a negative relationship was established between the variables under investigation within this study.

Evidence was also presented which indicated that there was basically no difference in the male and female groups regarding their gender-related perceptions of the androgynous communication style of their immediate supervisor. Results from the two parametric measures of job satisfaction (Satisfaction with Supervision and Satisfaction with Promotions extrapolated from JDI sub-scales) also indicated that there was no difference in the groups sampled. It was also found that the variances of the two groups was homogeneous. The males and females were considered to be comparable groups because they represented the same variability.

The conclusions drawn from the data would indicate that essentially men and women are similar in their perceptions of the negative relationship between the androgynous communication style of their supervisors and their overall job satisfaction. Basically, both the males and females in the sample saw little or no significant relationship between the variables under consideration.

CONCLUSIONS

During the decade of the 1970's, the concept of psychological androgyny flourished. In 1974, Sandra Bem conducted her now-classic empirical research on the "androgynous personality." Using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) as a

measurement of masculinity, femininity, and/or androgyny, Bem concluded that the androgynous person is one who is "both masculine and feminine, both assertive and yielding, both instrumental and expressive--depending on the situational appropriateness of these various behaviors" (Bem, 1974, p. 155). Bem further describes the androgynous person as one who "represents the very best of what masculinity and femininity have come to represent. . .a more balanced, a more fully human, truly, androgynous personality" (Kaplan & Bean, 1976, p. 51). This individual who combines the best of each of us "is a purely positive image of human potential" (May, 1980, p. 173).

This description of the androgynous personality led to a consideration of the hypothesis that in workplace institutions, subordinates' perceptions of the androgynous communication style of their immediate supervisor would lead to more positive feelings of job satisfaction. It was predicted that the androgynous supervisor would be perceived as the "good boss" and/or the "strong leader" in relationship to a subordinate's attitude regarding promotions and overall satisfaction on the job. It was assumed that the androgynous person would provide a style of supervision for future manager/supervisors which is neither all-autocratic nor all-democratic; neither all-authoritarian nor all-participative. The androgynous manager, it appeared, offered a new ideology for successfully managing people. It also led to the supposition that the androgynous communication style of supervisors was related to job attitudes and perceptions of job satisfaction as held by male and female subordinates who reported to these managers. It was thoughtat the outset of this study that subordinates who perceived their manager to be androgynous would also conceive of a more positive climate for the superior/subordinate renegotiations which occur in workplace contexts.

On the basis of the instruments used, analysis of the data gathered, and in terms of the stated purpose, the results of the present study would indicate that a significant relationship does not exist between an androgynous manager's communication style and employee's overall job satisfaction. It has been indicated from the data that the supervisor who is perceived by his subordinates to be androgynous, has not necessarily adopted a communication style which would lead to his employee's more positive feelings about promotions and general job satisfaction. The results of this study indicate that a subordinate who perceives his/her supervisor to be androgynous is not necessarily more satisfied on the job than is an employee whose boss is considered to be nonandrogynous. It can be concluded that perceptions of the androgynous communication style of manager/supervisors does not ensure a subordinate's job satisfaction.

The results of the study also suggest that males and females essentially indicated no difference in their perceptions of the variables under investigation. Results of the data further indicated that, aside from demographic differences, there are few, if any, differences between men and women in their perceptions of the relationship between the androgynous communication style of their supervisors and their satisfaction with the job.

Though there has been a whole corpus of empirical research in the last decade which supports androgyny as an "excellent standard for research" (Bem, 1976), this study would indicate that the androgynous manager will not offer to the employed subordinates of the 1980's a more positive feeling about promotional opportunities and overall job satisfaction. Perhaps it could be concluded that the androgynous communication style is not the answer for those searching for the "best" supervisory style. The combination of both masculine and feminine qualities into one androgynous manager may, indeed, not offer to either superiors or subordinates the

answer to the basic question: Under what style of supervision do subordinates perceive a greater degree of satisfaction with their job?

Perhaps the androgyny literature of the past decade has been a "dream" and it does not present to the organizational communication field a style of management for the 1980's. As organizations prepare to manage themselves in the future, the work of Fiedler (1966, 1967) and Morse & Lorsch (1970) suggests that indeed there is no "best" way for leading which exists in all managerial situations. The results of Fiedler's contingency theory studies indicate that effectiveness of leadership is contingent on such situational factors as superior/subordinate relations, task structure, and power positions. After an exhaustive study of these three variables, Fiedler concluded that

> One style of leadership is not in itself better than the other, nor is one type of leadership behavior appropriate for all conditions. . .If we want to improve organizational performance, we must deal not only with the leader's style but also with the factors in the situation (p. 247).

Future research might be directed to the replication of this study. More specific research might consider the assessment of subordinates' perceptions compared with the supervisor's own perceptions regarding the androgynous/nonandrogynous communication style of the supervisor. It would appear that both subordinates and supervisors evaluating the same superior would validate perceptions and thus provide a stronger subjective base for the measurement of communication style.

Another implication for research might be the inclusion of female supervisors in the sample. Women superiors were not included in this study due to the fact that so few occupy managerial positions. According to Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim in their best-selling book, The Managerial Woman, executive women are in the minority. As women predictably move into supervisory roles in the future, however, the need for research on the effects of their particular communication style on subordinate job satisfaction and the renegotiations in workplace institutions is evident.

TABLE 1

Correlations Between Androgynous Orientation and the Components of Job Satisfaction for 100 Males

Item	Components of Job Satisfaction	r	P
I:12	Years with Company	0.05	0.323
I:14	Time at Current Title	0.14	0.079
I:15	Feelings About Job	0.04	0.348
I:16	Ever Fired	0.02	0.423
I:17	Letter of Reprimand	0.13	0.106
I:18	Promotions	-0.04	0.330
I:19	Told Prospects Good	0.22*	0.014
I:20	Need Training to Advance	-0.05	0.298
I:21	Automatic Promotion	-0.01	0.467
I:22	On-the-job Training	-0.01	0.475
III	Satisfaction w/Supervision	0.05	0.326
IV	Satisfaction w/Promotions	-0.18*	0.038

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 2

Correlations Between Androgynous Orientation and the Components of Job Satisfaction for 100 Females

Item	Components of Job Satisfaction	r	P
I:12	Years with Company	0.05	0.304
I:14	Time at Current Title	0.22*	0.014
I:15	Feelings About Job	-0.03	0.402
I:16	Ever Fired	0.06	0.289
I:17	Letter of Reprimand	0.12	0.112
I:18	Promotions	-0.08	0.222
I:19	Told Prospects Good	0.04	0.358
I:20	Need Training to Advance	0.05	0.301
I:21	Automatic Promotion	0.12	0.126
I:22	On-the-job Training	0.00	0.491
III	Satisfaction w/Supervision	0.04	0.356
IV	Satisfaction w/Promotions	-0.07	0.258

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 3

POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATES BY MALE AND FEMALE SAMPLE
FOR PARAMETRIC DATA

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Standard Error	F Value	2-Tail Prob.	t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob.
II: Androgynous Orientation (BSRI)	100 Males	-1.9071	1.525	0.152	1.23	0.305	0.37	198	0.712
	100 Females	-1.8230	1.691	0.169					
III: Satisfaction w/Supervision (JDI)	100 Males	39.0700	14.024	1.402	1.17	0.446	0.10	198	0.921
	100 Females	38.8800	12,987	1.299					
IV: Satisfaction w/Promotions (JDI)	100 Males	7.9400	2.411	0.241	1.15	0.478	1.24	198	0.215
	100 Females	7.5300	2.245	0.224					

TABLE 4

Contingency Table Chi Square Values for the Ten Non-Parametric Variables

Item	Components of Job Satisfaction	Contingency Table	df	X^2	Sig
I:12	Years with Company	2x5	4	6.86	0.14
I:14	Time at Current Title	2x5	4	0.66	0.97
I:15	Feelings About Job	2x5	4	0.57	0.97
I:16	Ever Fired	2x2	1	3.46	0.06
I:17	Letter of Reprimand	2x2	1	0.82	0.37
I:18	Promotions	2x5	4	3.08	0.54
I:19	Told Prospects Good	2x2	1	15.91	0.00*
I:20	Need Training to Advance	2x3	2	3.96	0.14
I:21	Automatic Promotion	2x3	2	2.89	0.24
I:22	On-the-job Training	2x3	2	1.81	0.41

*P $\geq$.05

TABLE 5

Measures of Relationships Between Androgynous Orientation (BSRI) and Job Satisfaction for 100 Males

Rank	Component	Multiple R	R Square	Simple R	Beta
1	Told Prospects Good	.22	.05	.22	.15
2	Letter of Reprimand	.25	.06	.13	.13
3	Satisfaction w/Promotions	.28	.08	.18	.33
4	Satisfaction w/Supervision	.34	.11	.05	.22
5	Time at Current Title	.35	.13	.14	.20
6	Years with Company	.36	.13	.05	.12
7	Need Training to Advance	.37	.14	.01	.11
8	Feelings About Job	.38	.14	.04	.09
9	Ever Fired	.38	.14	.02	.03
10	Automatic Promotion	.38	.14	.01	.03

TABLE 6

Measures of Relationships Between Androgynous Orientation (BSRI) and Job Satisfaction for 100 Females

Rank	Component	Multiple R	R Square	Simple R	Beta
1	Time at Current Title	.22	.05	.22	.42
2	Promotions	.28	.08	.08	.15
3	Automatic Promotion	.32	.10	.11	.17
4	Letter of Reprimand	.35	.12	.12	.16
5	Years with Company	.35	.13	.05	.18
6	Satisfaction w/Promotions	.36	.13	.07	.10
7	Told Prospects Good	.37	.14	.04	.07
8	Need Training to Advance	.37	.14	.00	.03
9	Ever Fired	.38	.14	.06	.05
10	Satisfaction w/Supervision	.38	.14	.04	.02

APPENDIX A

I. Instructions: Please indicate your answers to the following questions. Your comments will be kept totally confidential.

12. How many years have you been employed with your present company?
_____Less than 1 year
_____1-2 years
_____3-5 years
_____6-10 years
_____Over 10 years (Specify_____)

14. How long have you been employed at your current title?
_____Less than 1 year
_____1-2 years
_____3-5 years
_____6-10 years
_____Over 10 years (Specify_____)

15. How do you feel about the job you now have?
_____Very dissatisfied
_____Dissatisfied
_____Indifferent
_____Satisfied
_____Very satisfied

16. Have you ever been fired? _____Yes _____No

17. Is there a letter of reprimand within your personal file? _____Yes _____No

18. Have you ever been promoted within your present company?
_____Never
_____Once
_____Twice
_____Three times
_____Four or more times (Specify_____)

19. Has your immediate supervisor or anyone higher in your organization ever told you that your prospects for promotion are good? _____Yes _____No

20. Do you think you will need additional training or schooling before you can advance to another title and/or a higher paying job within your company?
_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

21. Within your company, is there a policy which provides for an automatic promotion after an established probationary period?
_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

22. Does your company provide on-the-job training in order that you could get a better job within the system? _____Yes _____No _____Don't know

APPENDIX B

III. Instructions: The following words or short phrases ma, or may not describe a particular aspect of your job. For each item on the Supervision scale, please put a "Y" beside the word or phrase if it DOES describe your supervisor, an "N" if the item DOES NOT describe your supervisor, or "?" if you CANNOT DECIDE.

KEY: "Y" -- DOES DESCRIBE your supervisor
"N" -- DOES NOT DESCRIBE your supervisor
"?" -- UNDECIDED

SUPERVISION SUB-SCALE

_____ 1. Asks my advice
_____ 2. Hard to please
_____ 3. Impolite
_____ 4. Praises good work
_____ 5. Tactful
_____ 6. Influential
_____ 7. Up-to-date
_____ 8. Doesn't supervise enough
_____ 9. Quick tempered
_____ 10. Tells me where I stand
_____ 11. Annoying
_____ 12. Stubborn
_____ 13. Knows job well
_____ 14. Bad
_____ 15. Intelligent
_____ 16. Leaves me on my own
_____ 17. Lazy
_____ 18. Around when needed

IV. Instructions: The following three statements may or may not describe the organization in which you are employed. Please indicate, on a scale from 1 to 4, how each statement applies to your organization.

KEY: Mark a 1 if you STRONGLY DISAGREE.
Mark a 2 if you DISAGREE.
Mark a 3 if you AGREE.
Mark a 4 if you STRONGLY AGREE.

PROMOTIONS SUB-SCALE

_____ 1. I feel that there is an unfair promotional policy within this organization.
_____ 2. I feel that I am in a "dead-end job."
_____ 3. I feel that there is a limited opportunity for my advancement within this organization.

References

Ashour, A. S. The contingency model of leadership effectiveness: An evaluation. Organizational behavior and human performance, 1973, 9, 339-355.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. & Lenney, E. Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of personality and social psychology, 1976, 32, 540-545.

Bem, S. L. & Watson, C. Scoring packet: Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University, 1976.

Burns, J. M. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Dunnette, M. D., ed. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Fiedler, F. E. The effect of leadership and cultural heterogeneity on group performance: A test of the contingency model. Journal of experimental social psychology, 1966, 2, 237-264.

Fiedler, F. E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Fiedler, F. E. & Chemers, M. Leadership and effective management. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1974.

Fleishman, E. A. & Hunt, J. G., eds. Current developments in the study of leadership. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Graen, G., Dansereau, F., & Minami, T. Dysfunctional leadership styles. Organizational behavior and human performance, 1972, 7, 216-236.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. The managerial woman. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press, 1977.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Johnson, B. M. Communication: The process of organizing. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1977.

Kaplan, A. G. & Bean, J. P. Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976.

May, R. Sex and fantasy: Patterns of male and female development. New York: Norton, 1980.

Morse, J. J. & Lorsch, J. W. Beyond Theory Y. Harvard Business Review, 1970, 48, 61.

Pearce, W. B. & Sharp, S. M. Self-disclosing communication. Journal of communication, 1973, 23, 409-425.

Pelz, D. C. Influence: A key to effective leadership in the first-line supervisor. In E. A. Fleishman, ed. Studies in personnel and industrial psychology. Rev. ed. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1967, 407-416.

Pelz, D. C. Leadership within a hierarchical organization. Journal of social issues, 1951, 7(3), 49-55.

Rosen, N. A. Leadership change and work-group dynamics. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. & Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Vroom, V. H. Leadership. In Dunnette, M. D., ed. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1527-1551.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.